

Attorney Docket 2003-0755.02
U.S.S.N. 10/805,059

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action dated May 12, 2006, dependent claims 18-20 were objected to as being informal. With this Amendment, the preambles of each of claims 18 and 19 have been amended to correct the informality noted in the Office Action. No new matter is involved. Accordingly, it is believed that the objection to the claims has now been overcome.

Further in the Office Action, claims 1, 2 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,343,092 to Naoe et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0047389 A1 to Cannon et al.; claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '092 patent in view of the '389 published application and U.S. Patent No. 5,969,843 to Naiki et al.; claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '092 patent in view of the '389 published application and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0223203 to Kasai et al.; claims 6, 10 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '092 patent in view of the '389 published application and U.S. Patent No. 5,633,761 to Takashima et al.; claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '092 patent in view of the '389 published application, the '761 patent and the '203 published application; claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '092 patent in view of the '389 published application, the '761 patent and the '843 patent; claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '092 patent in view of the '389 published application and JP 2004034608; and claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '092 patent in view of the '389 published application, JP 2004034608 and the '203 published application. The Office Action further indicates that claims 7-9, 12, 14, 15 and 20 are directed to allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

With this paper, claim 20 has been deleted and its limitations have been added to independent claim 17. Accordingly, it is submitted that independent claim 17 and dependent claims 18 and 19 define patentable subject matter.

Further with this paper, claim 5 has been deleted. Also, claim 1 has been amended and now recites in pertinent part:

at least two adjustment brackets supported on said collimation housing;

Attorney Docket 2003-0755.02
U.S.S.N. 10/805,059

a light source supported by each of said adjustment brackets, each said light source defining a respective light beam axis;
at least two collimation lenses, each collimation lens supported in said collimation housing and intersected by one of said light beam axes;
each of said adjustment brackets being movable relative to said collimation housing to locate each of said light beam axes at a predetermined position relative to a respective collimation lens; and
each said light source being supported by a corresponding one of said adjustment brackets for movement in a direction parallel to said light beam axes.

Independent claim 10 recites:

at least two adjustment brackets supported on said collimation housing, each said adjustment bracket including a mount member;
a light source supported within each said mount member, each said light source defining a respective light beam axis, and each said light source being adjustable relative to a respective mount member in a direction parallel to said light beam axes;
at least two collimation lenses, each said collimation lens supported in said collimation housing and intersected by one of said light beam axes; and
each of said adjustment brackets being movable relative to said collimation housing to locate each of said light beam axes at a predetermined position relative to a respective collimation lens.

The Office Action states on page 9:

Naoe does not specifically teach a light source that is supported within each mount member where the light source is adjustable relative to a respective mount member in a direction parallel to said light beam axes.

The Office Action further states on pages 9 and 10:

Cannon does not specifically teach a light source that is supported within each mount member where the light source is adjustable relative to a respective mount member in a direction parallel to said light beam axes. Takashima teaches a light source (refer to element 42) that is supported within each mount member (refer to element 70) where the light source is adjustable relative to a respective mount member in a

Attorney Docket 2003-0755.02
U.S.S.N. 10/805,059

direction parallel to said light beam axes (refer to lines 13-24 of column 6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art *** to modify a collimation assembly, as taught by Naoe, to include *** a light source that is supported within each mount member where the light source is adjustable relative to a respective mount member in a direction parallel to said light beam axes, as taught by Cannon and Takashima ***.

As noted above, the Office Action states that the Naoe et al. patent and the Cannon et al. published application lack a teaching of a light source supported in a mount member so as to be adjustable parallel to an axis of a beam generated by the light source. The Office Action refers to the Takashima et al. patent as a teaching for providing a light source supported in a mount member so as to be adjustable parallel to an axis of a beam generated by the light source. The Takashima et al. patent teaches a laser diode holder 70 capable of moving in a direction Λ in Fig. 9 relative to an L-shaped base 41A. It is submitted that neither the Naoe et al. patent nor the Takashima et al. patent provides motivation or suggestion for effecting the modification to the structure in the Naoe et al. patent as espoused in the Office Action. In point of fact, there is no need to modify the structure in the Naoe et al. patent as the collimation lens holders 207 are "adjusted in the direction z so as to bring the emission points of the lasers 203 into alignment with the focuses of the associated collimator lenses 208," see column 6, lines 7-12 of the '092 patent. That is, there is no need to provide structure to allow the lasers 203 to move relative to the bases 201 since the lenses 208 move to allow an adjustment in the distance between the lasers 203 and the lenses 208 to be effected.

Further, it is completely unclear from a review of the Naoe et al. and Takashima et al. patents how the bases 201 in the Naoe et al. patent could be modified in view of the laser diode holder 70 and L-shaped base 41A in the Takashima et al. patent so as to create the combination of elements recited in independent claims 1 and 10. In point of fact, the only teaching for providing a light source supported by each of at least two adjustment brackets or mount members of adjustment brackets so as to be movable or adjustable parallel to axes of beams generated by the light sources and wherein the brackets are movable so as to locate the beam axes relative to a respective collimation lens comes from applicants' own specification, which cannot be used against them. U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0223203 to Kasai et al., U.S. Patent No.


Attorney Docket 2003-0755.02
U.S.S.N. 10/805,059

5,969,843 to Naiki et al. and JP 2004034608 also lack a teaching of a light source supported by each of at least two adjustment brackets or mount members of adjustment brackets so as to be movable or adjustable parallel to axes of beams generated by the light sources and wherein the brackets are movable so as to locate the beam axes relative to a respective collimation lens.

Accordingly, it is submitted that U.S. Patent No. 6,343,092 to Naoe et al., U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0047389 A1 to Cannon et al., U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0223203 to Kasai et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,633,761 to Takashima et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,969,843 to Naiki et al. and JP 2004034608, whether taken singly or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the subject matter set out in claims 1-4 and 6-16.

In view of the above remarks, applicants submits that claims 1-4 and 6-19 define patentably over the prior art. Early notification of allowable subject matter is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
STEVENS & SHOWALTER, L.L.P.

By 
Robert L. Showalter
Reg. No. 33,579

7019 Corporate Way
Dayton, OH 45459-4238
Telephone: 937-438-6848
Fax: 937-438-2124
Email: rshowalter@sspatlaw.com